

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.nspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/001,451	10/23/2001	Lisa A.G. Tweardy	1213-01	2404
22469	7590 07/30/2003			
	SCHNADER HARRISON SEGAL & LEWIS, LLP		EXAMINER	
1600 MARKE SUITE 3600	T STREET		MATHEW, FENN C	
PHILADELPH	HIA, PA 19103		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3764	
			DATE MAILED: 07/30/2003	12

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	_/1
Advisory Action	10/001,451 Examiner	TWEARDY ET AL.	
	Fenn Mathew	Art Unit 3764	
The MAILING DATE of this communic			
		·	
HE REPLY FILED 10 July 2003 FAILS TO F herefore, further action by the applicant is re- nal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only b ondition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notic examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFF	quired to avoid abandonment of thi e either: (1) a timely filed amendm e of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3	s application. A proper reply to a ent which places the application is	in
<u>PERIO</u> I	D FOR REPLY [check either a) or l	b)]	
a) \square The period for reply expires $\underline{4}$ months from the m	nailing date of the final rejection.		
 The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing da event, however, will the statutory period for reply ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST F 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.13 ave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period 	expire later than SIX MONTHS from the maili REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTH: 86(a). The date on which the petition under 37	ng date of the final rejection. S OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPE 7 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extensi	P ion fee
7 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later arned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	the shortened statutory period for reply original	ally set in the final Office action; or (2) as se	et forth ir
A Notice of Appeal was filed on37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension there			
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be	entered because:		
(a) they raise new issues that would re-	quire further consideration and/or s	search (see NOTE below);	
(b) \square they raise the issue of new matter ((see Note below);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the a issues for appeal; and/or	pplication in better form for appeal	by materially reducing or simplify	ying th
(d) M they present additional claims with	out canceling a corresponding nun	nber of finally rejected claims.	
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the follo	owing rejection(s):		
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _ canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	would be allowable if submitte	d in a separate, timely filed ame	ndmen
5.☐ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☐ application in condition for allowance be		en considered but does NOT place	ce the
The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be constrained by the Examiner in the final rejection.		OLELY to issues which were nev	vly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed a explanation of how the new or amende			n
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be)	as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	:	•	
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		disapproved by the Examiner.	
B. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed o			
B. The proposed drawing correction filed oD. Note the attached Information Disclosur	re Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper	No(s)	•

Continuation of 2. NOTE: Applicant has failed to claim any specific structure with regards to the cervical collar. The occipital support, chin strut, and lateral rods effectively encircle the neck of a user Applicant has provided no detail in the claimed language as to whether the cervical collar is unitary. Therefore, in the broadest reasonable interpretation, Lerman shows a portion that encircles the neck of a user.

NICHOLAS D. LUCCHESI SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700